

From: [Ron Gouquet](#)
To: [Erin Madden](#); [Marc Greenberg](#); [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Mary Baker](#)
Cc: [Aron Borok](#); [Ted Buerger](#); [Lisa Bluelake](#); [Rob Neely](#); [Brian Cunningham](#); [Jeff Baker](#); [Jeremy Buck](#); [Rick Kepler](#); [Katherine Pease](#); [Ray Givens](#); [Jim Anderson](#); [Patti Howard](#); [Rose Longoria](#); [Audie Huber](#); [Billy Barquin](#); [Val Lee](#); [Tom Downey](#); [Chris Thompson](#)
Subject: Re: revised sturgeon FSP
Date: 02/09/2007 07:57 PM
Attachments: [W-sturgeon-targeted-tissue-sample-discussionv1.1.doc](#)

Sorry for double sends -
Hey Erin... (since you asked...)
I spoke to McKenna yesterday. He said they (LWG) was overwhelmed (my word) with getting the Ph2 data report out by 2/23. He said that they had approved it on a vote with one abstention, whatever that means, by COB Wednesday. It's now in production (a large task in itself), hoo-rah?

Back to Sturgeon. Jeremy has sent the additional opportunistic sturgeon measurement endpoint recommendations scope to Tai Do & I sent it to McKenna and Mike Johns. Yesterday, I confirmed that LWG had it and learned that in the flurry of e-mails among the members, our request temporarily got lost. Jim realized & recirculated the e-mail with the scope, tasked the 'contractor' with providing their review by COB today. Johns (the contractor) had previously told me (late last week) that they were recommending to the client that the work be conducted as requested "by the Trustees"

Thus, we should hear a definitive response from LWG early next week and from what I've gleaned, one that agrees to work with us as proposed.

More Info:
At least one of our goals is for value (e.g., local scientists opportunistic and synergistic data desires) to benefit from the sacrifice these fish make as they give themselves to our scientific effort to protect sturgeon..

We did add the external viral swab & gonad sample opportunistic samples (to definitively determine sex of the immature sturgeon we are targeting) to our request and that is also being considered and I confirmed that Jim understands the request and that it was not intended to cost LWG anything, except incidental costs - primarily for sturgeon management purposes - that will bring specific expertise to our assistance in the upcoming field work, again at no cost to EPA or LWG.

In speaking to McKenna I explained that our's was a recommendation intending that we (the greater response & restoration team with LWG/EPA, etc) take advantage of the opportunity to preserve our ability (by discretely subsampling and preserving individual tissues) to potentially develop some, albeit limited, readily available information. This type info could well be useful, to reduce uncertainty with that assessment endpoint in the Ecological Risk Assessment.

Presently, our one measurement endpoint for this assessment endpoint is to compare whole body contaminant value, an aliquot from in a carefully prepared homogenate of each fish (i.e., giant "sturgeon smoothie") to very poorly understood whole body tissue TRV primarily valuable to provide relevant risk information for assessment of whole body dietary intake "Ingestion Risk". We suggest additional measurement endpoints that can be developed, again albeit with limited 'statistical power'.

In our scope of work and the "justification piece" (attached FYI - prepared to be responsive to Burt's request that the Trustees provide information on the 'ties to the ERA & remedial decisions'), we suggest specific additions that for low incremental cost could very cost effectively at least preserve our option to provide some, as Mr Bush might say "suggestatory", information as stated above .

Late today we (Chris, Jeremy & I) worked to address Burt's concern about the potential that our suggested subsamples could compromise, or some how systematically bias, the critical whole body tissue analytical result for each fish. We are attempting to explain that a basic scale comparison seem to indicate a low probability we are looking at a total of 200 grams (of various little bits of tissue per fish) as a percent of the total weight of the fish)

Anyway, sorry for the longwinded (fingered???) response to a simple question - but hope springs eternal!

Ron

Erin Madden wrote:
> I did not see anything in the newest sturgeon FSP regarding blood
> plasma and muscle plug samples. Has EPA or LWG agreed to let the
> Trustees take these samples? If so, shouldn't it be explicit in the FSP?
>
> erin
>
> Erin Madden
> Attorney at Law
> 4803 SE Woodstock, #135
> Portland, OR 97206
> 503-753-1310
> 503-296-2973 FAX
> erin.madden@gmail.com <<mailto:erin.madden@gmail.com>>
>

> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE
> This e-mail transmission is protected by the attorney-client or
> attorney work product privilege. If you are not the intended
> recipient, please immediately notify the sender and then delete this
> e-mail and destroy any copies that may have been made. Thank you.
>
>
>
>
>